



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

P

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/065,526	10/25/2002	Craig Duray Brossman	BLD920010031	2143

33595 7590 10/24/2007  
INTERNATIONAL BUSINESS MACHINES CORPORATION  
9000 SOUTH RITA ROAD  
TUCSON, AZ 85744

EXAMINER
----------

THOMAS, ASHISH

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2625

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

10/24/2007

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/065,526

Applicant(s)

BROSSMAN ET AL.

Examiner

Ashish K. Thomas

Art Unit

2625

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 June 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Response to Arguments***

1. Applicant's arguments filed 6/22/2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.
2. Before addressing the Applicant's remarks, the Examiner would like to clarify previous Examiner's(Jacob Rohwer) 35 USC 103 rejection of claim 6. Please note that Hower Jr(U.S. 5,467,434) teaches all of the subject matter identified in claim 6 except it fails to explicitly cite the concept of device independent printer options. And it is solely for this reason that Examiner Rohwer used the Mori reference(U.S. 6,433,882) since it explicitly cites the concept of device independent parameters in column 2, lines 26-31. Furthermore, notice that Hower Jr(U.S. 5,467, 434) cites two distinct type of data relating to a print job. In column 4, lines 5-10, Hower Jr divulges that a job ticket consists of programming parameters; these parameters stated in the Hower Jr reference reads on printer options stated in the claim language. Meanwhile column 3, lines 54-56 discusses the electronic documents that are the source of the print jobs; these electronic documents read on print source file stated in the claim language.
3. In page 10, lines 9-10 of the remarks, the Applicant contends the legitimacy of the cited references by stating that they disclose a method wherein "the printer options for a print job are not stored in a job ticket associated with the print source file, but are stored in the print source file itself."

The Examiner respectfully disagrees with this assertion. Notice that column 3, line 50-column 4, line 10 of the Hower Jr reference teaches a job ticket 35 that consists

Art Unit: 2625

of the electronic document used in the print job as well as other programming parameters. The electronic document reads on print source file while the programming parameters read on printer options. Therefore, Hower Jr clearly teaches that the printer options along with the print source file are both stored in a job ticket.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

**3. Claims 1-2, 4-7, 9-12 and 14-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent No 5,467,434 to Hower, Jr et al, in view of US Patent No 6,433,882 to Mori et al.**

Regarding claim 6, Hower Jr discloses an apparatus comprising:

a plurality of printers, each having printer capabilities that vary from other printers; **(Fig 2 12-1 through 12-N, Col 3 Lin 40-47)**

an information handling system **(Fig 2 #25 and #37)** communicating with said plurality of printers for selectively transmitting thereto specific print source files, **(Col 4 Lin 28-40)** said information handling system having a processor and memory associated with said processor; **(Col 4 Lin 49-64 discloses the combination examiner (#37) stores printer profiles so that printer capabilities can be compared to the desired options designated in the print job ticket.)**

program instructions stored in said memory accessible to said processor (**Col 4 Lin 52-55**) and effective when executing on said processor to:

allow an operator to select for a specific print source file (**Col 3 Lin 50-66**) set of desired printer options stored in a job ticket associated with the print source file; (**Fig 2 #16, Fig 4-5, Col 4 Lin 2-10**)

retain a set of definitions of printer capabilities for each of said plurality of printers; (**Col 4 Lin 49-51**)

compare the operator selected printer options with a definition of printer capabilities and then (**Col 4 Lin 52-55**)

if the printer options are available within the defined capabilities then sending the print source file to a selected printer which is responsive; (**Fig 8 discloses an example of evaluation of one desired option corresponding to a plurality of printer profiles and Col 6 Lin 5-19 discloses this comparison is done for all the desired print options, Fig 8 #72-1 discloses the job ticket and corresponding file is sent to the responsive printer's queue.**) and

signal an error if the printer options are unavailable within the defined capabilities. (**Fig 8 #54, Col 6 Lin 20-27**)

While Hower Jr. discloses using a high degree of generality with respect to comparing printer options with profiles for a wide variety of printer families and their corresponding parameters and rules, (**Col 9 Lin 14-35**) he does not *expressly* disclose that the original printer options selected via that user interface are *device independent*

printer options that are then converted to at least one printer specific command for use in the output of the job on one of the plurality of printers.

However, Mori discloses a printing system wherein, which uses a GDI and Enhanced Meta Files to indicate commands for printing, and further that the EMF's are converted to device dependent codes associated with a particular type of printer. **(Fig 2(b), Col 2 Lin 26-31, Col 6 Lin 14-28 and 56-62, Col 7 Lin 33-41 and Col 8 Lin 45-67, Fig 5, 6 and 12 give examples of some printer options.)**

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, to use conversion from device independent commands to device dependent commands as specified in Mori, in order to process the print job as specified in Hower Jr.

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to provide correct output of the desired print job according to a particular type of printer, **(Mori, Col 2 Lin 26-31)** in response to designated printer options entered by the user and compared using the combination examiner as specified in Hower, Jr.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine the Hower Jr and Mori Patents in order to obtain the invention as specified in claim 6.

Regarding claim 7, the combination further discloses in Mori that at least two of the stored definitions for the printing device data and capabilities are in differing command formats. **(Fig 14 #30(a) and #30(b), Col 7 Lin 1-13)**

Regarding claim 9, Mori further discloses the apparatus according to claim 6 wherein said program instructions when executing on said processor are further

effective to incorporate into a printable format data file the at least one printer specific command. **(Col 8 Lin 45-56)**

Regarding claim 10, Hower, Jr. further discloses the apparatus according to claim 6 wherein said program instructions when executing on said processor are further effective to signal at least a selected one of c) a message indicating that the requested option capability exceeds limits available to a printer which has a limited capability for the requested option. **(Fig 8 #54)**

Regarding claims 1-2 and 4-5, please see rejections of claims 6-7 and 9-10 above. Additionally the apparatus of claims 6-7 and 9-10 performs the methods of claims 1-2 and 4-5.

Regarding claims 11-12 and 14-15, please see rejections of claims 6-7 and 9-10 above. Additionally, Hower, Jr discloses a program. **(Col 4 Lin 49-55)**

**4. Claims 3, 8 and 13** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hower, Jr and Mori as specified in claims 1, 6 and 11 above, further in view of US Patent Application Publication No 2002/0015180 to Tominaga.

Regarding claim 8, the combination does not expressly disclose that at least three of the stored definitions and printer device data and capabilities are in differing command formats.

However, Tominaga has been found to disclose a document server that provides RIP processing according to at least three command formats. **(Fig 12 #1203(a-c), Para [0115])**

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the combination of Hower, Jr and Mori to provide the processing of print jobs in three differing command formats as specified in Tominaga.

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to provide a printing environment that can output a specified job, according to differing command formats. This would allow a wider variety of output jobs on more printers.

Therefore it would have been obvious to combine Hower, Jr and Mori with the Tominaga Publication in order to obtain the inventions as specified in claim 8.

Regarding claim 3, please see rejections of claim 8 above. Additionally the apparatus of claim 8 performs the methods of claim 3.

Regarding claim 13, please see rejections of claim 8 above.

**5. Claims 16-20** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hower, Jr and Mori as specified in claims 1, 6 and 11 above, further in view of US Patent No 6,476,927 to Schwarz Jr.

Regarding claim 18, the combination does not expressly disclose an apparatus according to claim 6 wherein said program instructions when executing on said processor are further effective to allow the operator to select a specified printer of the plurality of printers for the specific print job.

However, Schwarz Jr discloses a system of creating a print job ticket wherein program instructions executed on a processor are effective to allow the operator to select a specified printer amongst a plurality of printers for a specific print job. (Col 5 Lin 17-26)



At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, to use the printer override option allowing an operator to select a specific printer as specified in Schwarz, Jr., when outputting a print job as specified in the combination of Hower, Jr and Mori.

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to allow clients to designate a specific printer that he/she desires, without going through the comparison processing as specified in Hower, Jr.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Schwarz, Jr with the combination of Hower, Jr and Mori in order to obtain the invention as specified in claim 18.

Regarding claim 19, the combination further discloses in Schwarz Jr, an apparatus according to claim 18 wherein said program instructions when executing on said processor are further effective to compare the definition of printer capabilities for the specified printer with the set of device independent printer options to determine if the device independent set of desired printer options is within the defined capabilities of the specified printer. **(Fig 7 #74)**

Regarding claims 16-17, please see rejections of claims 18-19 above.  
Additionally the apparatus of claims 18-19 performs the methods of claims 16-17.

Regarding claim 20, please see rejection of claim 18 above. Additionally, Hower, Jr discloses a program. **(Col 4 Lin 49-55)**

### ***Conclusion***

Art Unit: 2625

**6. THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

**7.** Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ashish K. Thomas whose telephone number is 571-272-0631. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00 a.m. - 5:30 p.m. EST.


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Aung S. Moe can be reached on 571-272-7314. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2625

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.



Ashish K. Thomas



AUNG S. MOE  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
10/22/07